



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,316	04/16/2004	Yasuhiro Fujiwara	Q91046	7874
23373	7590	07/09/2008	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			BOLDEN, ELIZABETH A	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 800			1793	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/825,316	Applicant(s) FUJIWARA ET AL.
	Examiner ELIZABETH A. BOLDEN	Art Unit 1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/14/07
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

The IDS submitted 14 December 2007 have been considered by the Examiner.

Drawings

The original drawings received on 16 April 2004 are accepted by the Examiner.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is more than one paragraph in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected as to being indefinite since the glass composition is recited in terms of both weight and molar percentages. The use of mixed weight percent and mole percent ranges in the claims does not allow for one of ordinary skill in the art to derive the ranges of the other essential and optional components or to understand the scope of the claim as a whole.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori et al., Japanese Patent Publication 11-199269 in view of Otsuka et al., U.S. Patent 6,784,128

Mori et al. teach an optical glass in terms of wt percentages which appear to have overlapping ranges of components with instant claims 1-3, once converted. See Abstract and theoretical composition below. Mori et al. having overlapping ranges of refractive index and an Abbe number as recited in instant claims 4-6. See Abstract.

Mori et al. fails to teach that the optical glass is an optical element or press-molding preform and that the glass is made and used by the methods as recited in instant claims 7-25.

Otsuka et al. teach that phosphate glass can be used as optical elements and formed by press molding. See Abstract and column 1, line 10 to column 2, line 15.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have an optical glass of Mori et al. as suggested by Otsuka et al. because one of ordinary skill in the art would make an optical press molded preform from the optical phosphate glass as taught by Mori et al.

	P ₂ O ₅	Na ₂ O	MgO	BaO	ZnO	La ₂ O ₃
Wt %	43	2	2	50	2	1
Mol %	41	4.37	6.77	44.13	3.33	0.42

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1 April 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1793

Applicants' argue that the use of mixed weight percent and mole percent ranges in the claims does not make claims 2 and 3 indefinite, since a glass can be recited in terms of molar percentages and weight percentages. While a glass composition can have its components recited in terms of weight percentages or molar percentages, it is not clear when the glass composition has components partially recited in both weight and molar percentages.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH A. BOLDEN whose telephone number is (571)272-1363. The examiner can normally be reached on 10 am to 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jerry A Lorengo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1793

Elizabeth A. Bolden
Examiner
Art Unit 1793

EAB
3 July 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/825,316
Art Unit: 1793

Page 5